the said amount, if deposited, is not liable to be deposited under any law whatsoever. It is made clear that the undertaking is without prejudice to the petitioner's right to take appropriate directions from the Supreme Court, if so advised in this regard.

2 As this matter is of great importance, not only for the bulk drugs and formulations in question but on the principle to be settled from the point of view of the consumers we expedite the hearing of this case and direct that the case be listed for hearing on February 1, 1982 along with Civil Writ No. 538 of 1981 and other Drug price control matters.

3. Respondents to file a detailed counter affadivit to the petition with a copy to counsel for the petitioners within four weeks. Rejoinder, if any, to be filed within two weeks thereafter.

4. Liberty to the petitioners to file compilation of documents with copy to counsel for the respondents. Liberty to the respondents to file an additional affidavit if necessary to explain compilation permitted to be filed. Liberty to petitioners to file rejoinder, if necessary, before the next date of hearing.

Sd/- PRAKASH NATH
Chief Justic

Sd/- B. N. KIRPAL
Judge

November 25, 1981

True Copy
Examiner

Purchase of Certain Drugs

3056. SHRIMATI PRATIBHA SINGH Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the editorial captioned "Break the Deadly Nexus" which appeared in the *Indian Express* of 25th October, 1991, if so, what steps Government have taken to examine the allegations;

(b) whether it is a fact that although certain formulations have furnished purchase invoices for purchase of Ibuprofen, Trimethoprim, Sulphamethaxazole, Metranidazone and several other drug to BICP and Government;

(c) if so, the details of purchase invoices, names of drugs, purchase prices indicated against each drug and the price recommended for each by BICP; and

(d) what are the names of drugs for which Government allowed price increases without calling of fresh data and evaluating the claims of cost escalation and what are the names of drugs for which benefit was not passed due to reduction in price?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) Government has seen the editorial captioned 'Break the Deadly Nexus' which appeared in the *Indian Express* on 25th October, 1991. The allegation that the Government has failed to regulate prices of drugs and formulations is not correct. In a situation of rising costs of inputs and changes in exchange rate of rupee, certain amount of increase in the prices of medicines is inevitable and reasonable price increases have to be allowed if shortages are to be prevented.

(b) and (c) While fixing the prices of formulations either the notified price or the purchase price of the bulk drug, whichever is lower, is taken into account.

(d) Government has increased the prices of 54 bulk drugs on *suo moto* basis to compensate the manufacturers for increase in input costs due to exchange rate adiustments.

The requisite information with regard to such bulk drugs whose prices have been reduced during 1991 has been provided in reply to Rajya Sabha Unstarred question No. 673 answered on 28-11-1991.

Reviewing the Drugs (Price Control) Order

3057. MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government propose to review the Drugs (Prices Control) Order to reduce the number of Drugs under price control and to revise the norms for fixing prices;